

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. (US 6,983,232) in further view of Herman (US 2001/0034592). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. in view of Herman and in further view of Nakano et al. (US 2003/0018542).

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. (US 6,983,232) in further view of Herman (US 2001/0034592).

Nguyen et al. describes a customer benefit tool which allows customer models to be validated under acceptance test conditions to ensure that the machine based processes and cycle times have been accurately modeled. (Col. 2, lines 51 to 54). A user proposes a configuration for an assembly line by selecting objects that represent assembly line equipment, the objects having specific values for operating characteristics. "The configuration and associated operating characteristic values are then used to build a discrete event simulation." (Col. 3, lines 9 to 10). To streamline the building of a simulation by selecting and arranging the simulation objects, templates may be created and values may be read into the template to create the simulation object." (Nguyen Col. 3, lines 14-18). These simulation objects can also be formed using designer objects and templates. (Column 5, Line 56 to Column 6, Line 1).

Herman discloses a flexographic simulator and diagnostic system use for training personnel. It "gives the user "hands-on" experience in recognizing, analyzing measuring and correcting production problems within the printing process." (Page 1, Paragraph [0006]).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a method for simulating process flows in the graphics industry and for displaying the result calculated in the simulated process flows and/or intermediate results, comprising the steps of:

inputting or selecting at least one order data set representing a print job via a user interface of a computer;

selecting process data sets representing machines via a graphical user interface, the

process data sets representing the machines being stored in a library;

calculating links between the order data set and the process data sets as a function of the order data set and the process data sets;

creating a process flow from the calculated links;

calculating results or intermediate results for the process flow using the order data set;

and

outputting the results or intermediate results on a display of the computer.”

Support for the amendments found in the specification [0011] and the canceled claim 9, for example.

Nguyen et al. fails to teach or show “selecting process data sets representing machines via a graphical user interface, the process data sets representing the machines being stored in a library,” as recited in claim 1. With the present invention, the machines selectable out of the library are already completely modeled and tested, so the correct modeling is guaranteed. Nguyen et al. fails to provide this and uses an acceptance test to ensure accuracy. Furthermore there is no need to build simulation objects as stated in Nguyen et al., Column 9, Line 23, because the present invention process data sets representing the machines are easily accessible in the library. Nguyen et al. requires input by a simulation consultant and building of objects, the present invention does not.

In addition it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to have combined Herman and Nguyen et al. There is absolutely no reason or motivation to substitute any Herman teachings for Nguyen et al. Herman and Nguyen et al. are in different industries and have different purposes; Herman is for training and Nguyen et al. for a sales/ consulting demonstrations (Herman Page 1, Paragraph [0005], Line 7 and Nguyen et al. Col. 1, Lines 62 to 63). Furthermore, Herman is limited to the simulation of one flexographic machine for teaching the inside processes of a single flexographic machine, focusing on showing the correct operating for flexographic printing personnel. Herman does not teach or show the simulation of how several printing presses work together.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite: “A device for simulating process flows in the graphics industry and for displaying the result calculated in the simulated process flows or intermediate results on the display device, comprising:

at least one user interface for inputting or selecting at least one order data set representing a print job;

at least one graphical user interface for selecting process data sets representing machines;

at least one computer for calculating links between order data set and process data sets as a function of the order data set and the process data sets;

the computer for creating a process flow from the calculated links;

the computer for calculating the result or intermediate results for the process flow using the order data set; and

a display for displaying the results or intermediate results.”

Support found in the specification [0011], for example.

Nguyen et al. fails to teach or show “at least one graphical user interface for selecting process data sets representing machines,” as recited in claim 12. With the present invention, the process data sets representing machines are already completely modeled and tested, so the correct modeling is guaranteed. Nguyen et al. fails to provide this and uses an acceptance test to ensure accuracy. Furthermore there is no need to build simulation objects as stated in Nguyen et al., Column 9, Line 23, because the present invention process data sets representing the machines are easily accessible in the library. Nguyen et al. requires input by a simulation consultant and building of objects, the present invention does not.

In addition it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to have combined Herman and Nguyen et al. There is absolutely no reason or motivation to substitute any Herman teachings for Nguyen et al. Herman and Nguyen et al. are in different industries and have different purposes, Herman is for training and Nguyen et al. for a sales/ consulting demonstrations (Herman Page 1, Paragraph [0005], Line 7 and Nguyen et al. Col. 1, Lines 62 to 63). Furthermore, Herman is limited to the simulation of one flexographic machine for teaching the inside processes of a single flexographic machine, focusing on showing the correct operating for flexographic printing personnel. Herman does not teach or show the simulation of how several printing presses work together.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 to 3, 5 to 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al.

on view of Herman and in further view of Nakano et al. (US 2003/0018542).

Nguyen et al. is discussed above.

Herman is discussed above.

Nakano et al. discloses a machine element selection support system “which not only allows easy input and correction of information necessary for selection of a machine element such as a bearing at the customer’s side but also is able to provide the optimum selection results of the machine element according to the wish of the customer in a short time.” (Page 1, Paragraph [0004]).

Claims 11 recites: “the process data sets contain dimensions associated with graphics industry devices or the dimensions associated with the devices are displayed on a display device.”


Both Nguyen et al. and Herman fail to teach or show “the process data sets contain dimensions associated with graphics industry devices or the dimensions associated with the devices are displayed on a display device,” as recited in claim 11. It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Nguyen et al., Herman and Nakano et al. Furthermore there is no motivation to modify Nguyen et al. and Herman in view of Nakano et al.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris (Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940